REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 remain in the application with claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 having been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the Abstract.

A new Abstract has been provided that is intended to more clearly point out the inventive features of the present invention and that corrects the informality noted by the examiner.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the specification.

The specification has been amended hereby to insert the paragraph suggested by the examiner.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the claims as containing informalities.

Each of the instances noted by the examiner in paragraph 5. of the instant official action has been corrected in the amendments made to the claims hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Odake et al.

The present invention is intended to provide a display apparatus having a plurality of individual display elements mounted on a single transparent substrate. Prior to the present invention any such relatively large type display had to be made as a mosaic-type or matrix-type situation, as shown in Fig. 14. This is because it was difficult to energize each of the individual display elements when there are a large

number of such display elements due, to signal loss and the like. According to the present invention, the plurality of individual display elements are placed on a single transparent substrate and then each of the individual display elements has its own individual driver circuit and an individual circuit substrate attached or mounted thereon. By providing an individual driver circuit for each of the individual display elements, the problems of the prior art are solved in that long conductor runs and the like are not required.

Odake et al. does, in fact, relate to a display apparatus having a plurality of display elements. Nevertheless, as in the so-called acknowledged prior art of the present application there are driver units, or driver integrated circuits, forming the drive circuits mounted on a printed circuit board by soldering and the like and there are provided column electrode drive circuits and row electrode drive circuits for the EL display apparatus. Nevertheless, as clearly seen in Fig. 2, for example, there is only one driver integrated circuit for a large number of display elements since there are only eight driver circuits (10) shown in Fig. 2 and clearly there are many, many more than eight display elements in the overall display apparatus shown in Odake et al.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Odake et al. fails to anticipate the present invention because it does not suggest the provision of a plurality of drive circuits equal in number to a plurality of individual display elements,

as taught by the present invention and as recited in amended claim 1.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Odake et al. in view of Shioya et al.

Shioya et al. is cited for its discussion of a flexible film-like substrate.

Nevertheless, claim 2 depends from claim 1, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove is thought to be patentably distinct over Odake et al and, for at least those very same reason, claim 2 is also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover. It is respectfully submitted that Shioya et al. does not cure the deficiency of Odake et al. concerning the plurality of drive circuits.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Odake et al. in view of Matsuzawa.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove, is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited reference and for at least those very same reasons claim 5 is also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

Matsuzawa does not cure the deficiency of Odake et al. relating to the plurality of drive circuits corresponding in number to the plurality of display elements, as in the presently claimed invention.

Notice is respectfully taken of the indication that claims 10 and 4 would be allowed if claim 10 is corrected to overcome the objection set forth in this office action.

Claim 10 has been amended hereby to correct the informality appearing therein. Claim 4 depends from claim 10 and, thus, is also respectively submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Notice is respectfully taken of the indication that claims 6-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Nevertheless, in view of the amendments made to claim 1 hereby, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6-9 are nonetheless allowable in their dependent form.

Accordingly, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that a direct-view-type display apparatus having a plurality of drive circuits equal in number a plurality of individual display elements, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references alone or in combination.

The reference cited as of interest has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

7217/64306-Z

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

Jay H. Maioli.
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:gr